U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management Carson City District Office

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Project Creator: Dave Schroeder

Field Office: Stillwater NVC01000

Lead Office: Stillwater

Case File/Project Number: NVN-91562

Applicable Categorical Exclusion: 516 DM 11.9: F(10) "Disposal of mineral materials such as sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, cinders, and clay in amounts not exceeding 50,000 cubic yards of disturbing more than five (5) acres, except in riparian areas."

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2013-0010-CX

Project Name: Antelope 30 Road Pit Free Use Permit

Project Description: The Churchill County Road Department is requesting a Free Use Permit for up to 10,000 cubic yards of sand and gravel borrow material from an existing pit in Edwards Creek Valley. The material would be used for maintenance on the "Antelope 30" Road that runs roughly north/south on the east side of Edwards Creek Valley. The pit in question is one previously approved for a negotiated sale to Envirotech Drilling LLC (NVN-90387) on October 18, 2011.

Applicant Name: Churchill County Road Department

Project Location: MDM T. 21N, R. 39E, Section 2, S½SE¼

Land Use Plan Conformance: This action is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001) page MIN-1, RMP Level Decisions, Desired Outcomes 1. "Encourage development of energy and mineral resources in a timely manner to meet national, regional and local needs consistent with the objectives for other public land uses.

Name of Plan: Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001)

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria: (Specialist review: initial in appropriate box)

If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.	YES	NQ
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or		
safety? (Range-Jill Devaurs)		OX.
2. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on such natural resources		1
and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park,		W
recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural		/
landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands		İ
(EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO		
13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? (Archeology,		
Recreation, Wilderness, Wildlife, Range by allotment, Water Quality)		De
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or		
involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources		
[NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (PEC)		MIS
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant		
environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		/m>
5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent		
a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant		
environmental effects? (PEC)		My
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with		
individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?		
(PEC)		11/1/>
7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or		10
eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office?		M
(Archeology)		1
8. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on species listed, or		1
proposed to be listed, on the list of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have	l	9
significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? (Wildlife)		<i>I</i> .
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law		
or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (PEC and	1	1.
Archeology)		MyX
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect		//.
on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		14/2
11. Would the Proposed Action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian		
sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly		nw
adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007)?		IVY
(Archeology)		
12. Would the Proposed Action contribute to the introduction, continued		$\overline{}$
existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species known to occur in the		()
area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the	1	A
range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and EO 13112)?		\sim 1.
(Range-Jill Devaurs)		

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:

During ID Team review of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

Planning Environmental Coordinator, Steve Kramer: IMZ 10/22/12
Public Health and Safety/Carrier AV Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: 10-22-12 Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: 10/22-/2
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: 10-12-12
Archeology, Susan McCabe: JAson Western pur 10-22-12
Water Quality

Water Quality,

Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson:

CONCLUSION: Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

Approved by:

J. Knutron 10/22/2015

Field Manager

Stillwater Field Office

